

A Slavic Translation of the Ohrid Chrysobull of 1273¹

David J. Birnbaum
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
Harvard University

Copyright © 1988 by David J. Birnbaum
All rights reserved

The Greek Text of the Ohrid Chrysobull

According to various accounts,² Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus (1259–82) issued a chrysobull in August 1272³ defining the territory of the Ohrid Archbishopric. Threatened by opponents allied with Charles of Anjou, the emperor sought through this edict to reestablish imperial authority over the autocephalous Serbian and Bulgarian churches by bringing them under the control of the Greek see of Ohrid. Michael was later forced to enlist papal protection against Charles, the price for which was a short-lived union with Rome, proclaimed at the 1274 Council of Lyons, and the Angevin menace was decisively averted only with the Sicilian Vespers of 1282.

The Ohrid chrysobull incorporates the text of three chrysobulls issued by Basil II (Bulgaroctonus),⁴ which listed territories subordinate to Ohrid. Michael's preface and conclusion assert that the see of Ohrid is to be equated with Justiniana Prima, that it is proper to show respect to preceding emperors by enforcing their edicts (it is in this context that Basil's chrysobulls are introduced), and that territories that have, for various reasons, left the control of the see of Ohrid should be returned to it.

Michael's original chrysobull has not survived, but two later Greek copies are known. An incomplete copy from the Codex Gerasimi⁵ contains only Michael's introduction and the beginning of the first of Basil's included chrysobulls.⁶ This copy makes no mention of Michael and bears no date, but a complete and dated copy was later found by Porfirij Uspenskij at the Catherine Monastery in Sinai.⁷ The text of the inserted eleventh century chrysobulls from the Sinai copy was published in 1871⁸ and the complete text of the chrysobull according to the Sinai manuscript in 1911.⁹ A critical edition of Basil's chrysobulls, with variants from the two manuscripts, was published in 1893.¹⁰

The Date of the Ohrid Chrysobull According to the Sinai Manuscript

The Sinai copy of the Ohrid chrysobull bears the following closing:

προσέσται τοίνυν ὁ παρὼν χρυσόβουλλος τῆς βασιλείας ἡμῶν τῇ
ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ πάσης Βουλγαρίας τῇ καὶ Πρώτῃ

Ἰουστινιανῇ εἰς διαρκούσαν τῶν εἰρημένων βεβαίωσιν, ὁ καὶ ἀπολυθεὶς κατὰ μῆνα τοῦτον τῆς ἐνισταμένης ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ἑξακισχilioστοῦ ἑπτακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ ἔτους, (π. 125^b) ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον εὐσεβὲς καὶ θεοπρόβλητον ὑπεσημήνατο κράτος: —

Ἐἶχε καὶ ὑπογραφὴν διὰ χρυσῶν γραμμάτων καὶ βασιλικῆς χειρός:

Μιχαὴλ ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ πιστὸς βασιλεὺς καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ Ῥωμαίων
Δούκας Ἄγγελος Κομνηνὸς ὁ Παλαιολόγος: —

The date in the text, κατὰ μῆνα τοῦτον τῆς ἐνισταμένης ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ἑξακισχilioστοῦ ἑπτακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ ἔτους, conforms to the standard pattern for dating imperial documents: κατὰ μῆνα ... τῆς ἐνισταμένης ... ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ... ἔτους,¹¹ but the Sinai manuscript includes τοῦτον after μῆνα and omits the name of the month and the indiction number.

Golubinskij¹² dates the Ohrid chrysobull to August 1272 (= 6780). In his summary of the textual history of this document, Novaković¹³ observes that Golubinskij suggested both Michael's authorship and the date without publishing the portions of the text that support these conclusions. Benešević's edition of the Sinai copy explains how Golubinskij determined the year, but there seems to be no direct evidence for assigning this document to August. While the August 1272 dating has been generally accepted by Byzantinists and is regularly repeated in the literature,¹⁴ the Slavic translation of this chrysobull, discussed below, suggests that it should be reconsidered.

The Slavic Text of the Ohrid Chrysobull in Muz. 3070

In addition to the two Greek copies discussed above, one fifteenth-century copy of a Slavic translation of the Ohrid chrysobull has survived. Muz. 3070 in the Lenin Library in Moscow (Codex Moskva, GBL, Fond 178 [Muzejnoe sobranie], No. 3070) consists of four paper folia removed by V.I. Grigoróvič from Zogr. 151, a large miscellany, during an 1844 visit to the Zograph monastery.¹⁵ 1R–2R contains the conclusion of the *Life of Stefan Lazarevič*¹⁶ and 2V–4V contains the text of the Ohrid chrysobull. Apparently, Grigorovič showed this manuscript to Šafařík, for Jireček, after commenting on the August 1272 chrysobull, adds that “в 1273 г. (6781) Михаил утвърдил също тъй и правата на отдавна вече престаналата да съществува църква ‘Justiniana prima,’ която фалшиво се отъждествява с Охридската. Един лош превод на оригинала, направен вероятно от някой влах или грък, се намирал в препис от XVI или XVII в. у проф. Григорович. Извадки от текста има в книгата на покойния Шафарик.”¹⁷ Thus, it seems that Jireček accepted Golubinskij's dating of the chrysobull and assumed that Grigorovič had a copy of a second, similar edict which had been issued the following year.¹⁸

Despite the reference by de Thallóczy et al.¹⁹ to Grigorovič's account of his travels,²⁰ there is no specific mention of the Slavic text of the Ohrid chrysobull in this report.²¹ And Šafařík's only published comment on the Slavic translation of the chrysobull is a single sentence at the end of his discussion of a different document: "V jiné písemnosti Ochridské od Michala Palaeologa l. 1273, rovněž zkomolené, připomínají se listiny od Justiniana, Basilia II. (976-1025), Manuele (1143-1170) atd."²² Wenzel, following Šafařík, dates the chrysobull to 1273; he also notes the existence of Grigorovič's Slavic copy.²³

Aside from the brief notes mentioned above, there was no proper study of the Slavic translation of the Ohrid chrysobull during Grigorovič's lifetime, and the manuscript was not found among his papers. It reappeared as Muz. 3070, first mentioned in the 1889 "Otčet moskovskogo publičnogo i Rumjancevskogo muzeev za 1886-88 gg.," but by this time the provenance of this manuscript and its association with Grigorovič had been forgotten.

Muz. 3070 was rediscovered and described by Seliščev, who published a photographic reproduction of page 3R (which he called 2R).²⁴ Seliščev's brief article also includes a physical description of the manuscript, excerpts from the texts, and historical and textual comments on the chrysobull. The chrysobull text is on pages 2V through 4V of the manuscript, which Seliščev called 1V through 3V. Unfortunately, Seliščev's discussion of the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 is unsatisfactory in several ways.²⁵

First, there are inaccuracies in the transcriptions (although the excerpts in Seliščev's article are far more reliable than those in the 1889 "Otčet"). Second, Seliščev believed that all of Muz. 3070 represented a translation from Greek,²⁶ while the *Life of Stefan Lazarevič* is actually an original Slavic composition. Third, Seliščev incorrectly considered the Slavic text of the chrysobull an abridged translation. Fourth, Seliščev's comments on the discrepancy in dates between the Slavic and Greek texts are inadequate. These last two points are discussed below.

The Original Content of the Slavic Translation

As mentioned above, Seliščev considered the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 an abridged translation, observing that "Михаил Палеолог по ходатайству Охридского архиепископа утверждает за ним все епархии, какие показаны в грамотах Василия Болгаробойца. Списки с этих грамот включены в хрисовул Михаила. Но в славянский перевод эти грамоты не вошли. Нет и тех строчек грамоты Михаила, которые относятся к грамотам Василия."²⁷ While Seliščev's observations about the lacunae in Muz. 3070 are correct, the phrase "не вошли" suggests a deliberate or accidental omission by the translator. In fact, the Slavic text was surely complete originally; it breaks off in the middle of a sentence at the end of 2V and resumes in the middle of a word on 3R

(...ЖНТН, probably ПОЛОЖИТН or ПРѢДЛОЖИТН; the Greek reads διεκτεθῆναι), which suggests that what has survived as Muz. 3070 is the beginning and end of what was originally a longer text. The missing portion would fill four folia, which may have been removed by somebody interested in the information contained in the inserted eleventh century documents.²⁸

The Date of the Ohrid Chrysobull According to Muz. 3070

In a brief comparison of the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 and the Sinai manuscript, Seliščev correctly notes that "не совпадает и дата. Но тут переводчик обнаружил недосмотр: он спутал '700' и '80', рядом находящиеся в греческом тексте."²⁹

The Slavic date reads as follows (4V16-18):

16. по мѣсѣ сѣго юуѣа насѣоѣцаго прѣваго ѡнаѡкѣіѡна <...>
17. Ѱмѣ ѡсмоѣѣнѣоу прѣвое лѣпо бѣ нѣѣ ѡнѣ бѣгоу <...>
18. на рѣннаа на зѣнамена дрѣжава.

Following Seliščev's suggestion that ѡсмоѣѣнѣоу should be understood as a mistranslation of οὐδοηκοστοῦ, the year in the Slavic copy can be amended to read (6)781 (= 1273), which still differs from the date in the Sinai copy, which reads 6780 (= 1272). If, however, we assume that the word πρῶτου (or simply α) was dropped from the Greek copy, we can reconstruct the original year of issue as 1273. The Sinai manuscript has no indiction number, but 1273 corresponds to the first indiction, which is recorded in the Slavic text and which supports the hypothesis that it is the date in the Sinai manuscript that is defective. The 1273 date still places this edict before the 1274. Council of Lyons, a time when Michael was concerned with consolidating imperial authority. Finally, while it is unclear what external evidence accounted for Golubinskij's attribution of this chrysobull to August, the Slavic text provides direct evidence for dating it to July.

The Translation of the Ohrid Chrysobull

The unintelligibility of the Slavic text of the Ohrid chrysobull leaves no doubt that it is not the work of a skilled translator with a good knowledge of both languages. Jireček attributes the poor quality of the translation to an inadequate knowledge of Slavic on the part of a Wallachian or Greek translator.³⁰ Seliščev, on the other hand, asserts that "переводчик не владел свободно греческим языком."³¹ Neither scholar provides any evidence or argument for his evaluation of the nationality of the translator.

A careful comparison of the texts supports Seliščev's analysis. We would expect to find morphological barbarisms in the work of a translator whose knowledge of

Slavic was so poor that he could transform an intelligible Greek text into such unintelligible Slavic, but the Slavic words are basically correct morphologically, and such morphological barbarisms as do occur (e.g., πο ῥῶ 3R1) are not uncommon in middle Bulgarian and Macedonian texts. In fact, all the peculiarities of the Slavic text can be explained by hypothesizing that a Slav with a poor knowledge of Greek translated this document word by word, imposing the unwieldy Greek syntax on his translation. There are no unexpected phonological or morphological features in the Slavic text and all the awkwardness can be attributed to the syntax. On the other hand, there are many examples of misreadings of the Greek text, including misconstrued syntax, faulty division of words, and faulty translation of idioms. All of these betoken a failure to understand the sense of the Greek.

Thus, the phrase ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ φιλεῖ πολλάκις μὴ πρὸς τέλος παραμένειν, ἄλλ' ἔστιν ὅπου δὴ καὶ συνεχῶς μετακινεῖσθαι τὰ πράγματα can be understood as 'but whereas it is often usual that things do not remain [stable] until the end, but it is the case that they continuously move in whatever direction . . .' The Slavic translation on 3R4-6 reads: *НѢ ПОНЕ^Ж ЛЮ/БОВѢ МНѠЖИЦЕЮ НЕ БѢ КОИЦѢ ПРѢБИВАЕ7Ѣ. НѢ Е^Ж ИДѢ^Ж ОУБО И НЕО/СЛАВНО ПОВННѠ7И СЕ ДѢЛО^М*. The translator misinterpreted the idiom φιλεῖ 'it is usual' as ЛЮ/БОВѢ, which he considered the subject of 'remain,' in place of 'things.' Such mistakes are more likely to reflect a misunderstanding of the Greek than an inadequate knowledge of Slavic.

Similarly, the phrase καὶ σὺν τῷ εὐλόγῳ δικαίαν ἅμα προὔτεινεν αἵτησιν can be understood as 'and according to the proper conduct of affairs he indeed put forth a just request.' The Slavic translation on 3V11 reads: *И СѢ БЛВѢНІЕМЪ ПРѢВНѠЕ КѠПНО ПРѢВА БІМНІ ИМЖЕ/*, which suggests that the translator felt that προὔτεινεν αἵτησιν included the lexemes πρῶτος, εἶναι, and τίσιν. Even if we were to assume that a Greek might have had difficulty understanding this document, it seems unlikely that he could have arrived at a reading so at variance with Greek grammar.

The phrase εἴ τις ἴσως γε καὶ ἔχει προτείνειν οἰονοῦν ἐκ βασιλέως δικαίωμα can be understood as 'and if someone equally will set forth a justification by an emperor.' The Slavic translation on 4R19 reads: *<...>РѢВНО ЖЕ И ИМА^М ПРѢВНІИ ОУМЪ И ОУБО Ѡ ЦРѢ ОПРАВА^МНІЕ*, which suggests that the translator felt that προτείνειν οἰονοῦν reflected the lexemes πρῶτος, νοῦς, οἶος, and οὖν. Once again, this is evidence of a translator who could not understand the Greek, rather than merely a person who could not express himself in Slavic.

Finally, the phrase καὶ τὰ πρεσβεῖα προσοδοῖημεν can be understood as 'and we return the prerogative.' The Slavic translation on 4V4-5 reads: *И СТАРѢ/ ЛНЦѠ ДАЕМЪ*, which suggests that the translator interpreted πρεσβ- as стар- and, furthermore, thought he detected the lexeme πρόσωπον in προσοδοῖημεν. Once again, the incorrect division of words and the inability to recognize that the alleged Greek words are not properly formed suggests a translator whose weakness is in Greek, rather than Slavic.

Seliščev argues that disagreements between the archbishop of Ohrid and the patriarch of Constantinople in the beginning of the XV century concerning the limits of the authority of the former might have provided a reason for renewed attention to this chrysobull, and perhaps for its translation into Slavic.³² Seliščev's further assumption, however, that all of Muz. 3070 represents part of translation of a Greek miscellany can not be maintained, although many of the texts in Zogr. 151, the source of Muz. 3070, are translations from Greek. Finally, it remains unclear whether the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 represents an immediate translation from Greek or a copy of a Slavic intermediary.

Appendix — Texts

This appendix includes the Slavic text of the Ohrid chrysobull according to Muz. 3070 and the portions of the Greek text that correspond to the Slavic according to Sin. 508 (976), as published by Benešević.³³ Variants included by Benešević in footnotes are reproduced here in parentheses in the body of the text. Page references to the Slavic manuscript have been introduced into the Greek text in parentheses.

The transcription of the Slavic text retains as many of the orthographic peculiarities of the original as possible in a typeset version. I have supplied line numbers and introduced spaces between words, which are run together in the original, and I have added comments in square brackets before any marginal notations in the manuscript.³⁴

1. Ел^ама бл^ага цркаа по конуи^нт бл^агоговѣ^ни^н проавла^е Мн^ѡ
2. же н сѣ бл^авені^е н^ѡсн^ть правѣн^ѡе. вел^ико б^ѡ б^ѡлювл^ені^е.
3. коупно б^ѡ бл^агораз^ѡмі^е принос^н ѿ сл^а. н гадані^е в^сѣ не ма
4. ло, ѣ к^ѡ б^ѡ в^ѣ б^ѡв^ѣа^тн^ѣ пон^ѣ б^ѡ ѡп^ѡу^ѡ у^ѡс^ѡт^ѡю тѣ прѣб^ѡсход^ѡн^ѡ
5. в^ѡцр^ѡн^ѡш^ѡн^ѡм^ѡ. п^ѡн^ѡеже др^ѡб^ѡг^ѡн^ѡ н^ѡѣк^ѡн^ѡ ѿ ц^ѡрк^ѡн^ѡ д^ѡл^ѡг^ѡ прѣж^ѡѣ н
6. н^ѡн^ѡ о^ѡубо л^ѡт^ѡы м^ѡн^ѡг^ѡы^ѡм^ѡ прѣб^ѡв^ѡш^ѡн^ѡм^ѡ др^ѡев^ѡн^ѡш^ѡем^ѡн^ѡ во
7. спр^ѡн^ѡет^ѡн^ѡ ѡ др^ѡб^ѡ др^ѡб^ѡга. ѡ аще н^ѡсповѣда^ѡем^ѡ ѡ б^ѡит^ѡн^ѡ с^ѡщ^ѡи^ѡ <н>
8. н^ѡн^ѡк^ѡт^ѡ же в^ѡз^ѡм^ѡож^ѡе посн^ѡг^ѡн^ѡб^ѡн^ѡт^ѡн^ѡ показ^ѡан^ѡі^ѡ. нѣ да о^ѡубо ѡ з^ѡд^ѡѣ<...>
9. о^ѡуд^ѡб^ѡное сл^ѡва Ѧб^ѡнаж^ѡн^ѡ. пос^ѡт^ѡн^ѡз^ѡа^ѡет^ѡ н^ѡѣко^ѡѡ н^ѡ ѡже в^ѡ ц^ѡр^ѡ<ѣх>
10. пр^ѡп^ѡп^ѡм^ѡн^ѡн^ѡм^ѡы ѡу^ѡсп^ѡн^ѡн^ѡн^ѡн^ѡ ѡ. н^ѡѣ т^ѡб^ѡѡю в^ѡс^ѡем^ѡн^ѡ др^ѡѣв^ѡн^ѡ<н^ѡм>
11. л^ѡт^ѡѣ в^ѡел^ѡн^ѡко^ѡ. ѣ н^ѡа д^ѡѣлы пос^ѡт^ѡн^ѡг^ѡ прѣс^ѡл^ѡав^ѡное. нѣ н^ѡ п^ѡм^ѡет^ѡ<ѣ>

[Left margin, line 11: 7ѡѡю]

12. Ѡсѣавль прѣсвѣтлѣ оудованъ въ тоу бо жнвѡщїи бѣ<госло>
13. бѣниѣ спѣшно нѣкоѣ промышлѡ. ꙗко да нзъавѣтъ ед<...>
14. Ѡ спѣвшен архнєпїинъ болгарскѡн показавъ. юже пѡб<...>
15. бѡ іоусѣнїанїю ѡ своего имени именова. ѡ ѡнѡ бо сїѡ <...>
16. ше ѡфьсзо· сїѡ бѡ слѡ имѣ плѣтсьскоѣ помоу начети рож<...>
17. бса събрѣши зоре, и тѣцѣнїе велнчаншїи полагаше ꙗже оу<...>
18. аше се́моу и пи́ще се́н велико дово́лно. прилагаетъ ѡ<...>и
19. ен и прѣмнѡгаа прнводѣ. ѹсѣн же и свѣтлотѡ. ѡ ноуже и и
20. з далѣ оубѡ бл҃гоучсантин. ꙗко да се́н ѡ ны́ старѣши́нꙋ сзо ѡда се
21. и елѣкымн се́н поутѣп се ре́ннымын. и елѣкы тѣ Ѡ архнєрєнсѣ,
22. поу́ченныѣ цркѡвъ Ѡ снѣ ѡлоу́чн· Ѧба ꙗко мнѡгын и велѣкын
23. сѣ оуспѣвъ· и ꙗ оубѡ цркын имать дѣпн рѣзоу́ любоуѣмно
24. на имѣ съедннѣен и спѣшїи ѡ съдрьжаше старѣшѣ рїма папа
25. єунгнїѡ. по елѣкоу се́н вхѡтещоу моурьсзовѣтн слѣ. и

[Left margin, line 25: єупігілнѡ]

26. ꙗко оубо съпрѣываѣти Ѡб'сѣоанїа всѣмн лѣты дан'наа нꙗло
27. жєніє хрсовѣла сїмн словєсы н цркымн оудрѣжати повєль
28. нмн' прѣываѣше оубо на мнѡзѣ сѣоею славою Ѡблѣчєна
[Lower margin:] ѿзврати се <...> ѿ 7ε3ara

3R

1. жнѣн по гла҃хъ ѿзложѣнъ ныѣ свѣткѣ ѿсѣавшиѣ ѿ багрѣнорѣныѣ само
2. дрѣць. еже ѿсѣу ѣ вѣдома по ѿменнъ ѿмѣше бо оубо сѣце сѣа да҃ до.
3. мнѡга ѿ мнѡжн прѡуѣн црѣе по҃га сѣ сѣмоуѣнїе прїеѣше волю
4. неѣзбрана сѣцеваа ѿ сѣн на архїеппїи показаше. нѣ понѣ лю
5. бѡвъ мнѡжнїею не ѣ коѣць прѣвыѣаеѣ. нѣ ѣ нде оубо ѿ неѡ
6. славно по҃внѣнѡѣн се дѣлѡ. нѣ на сѣн сѣврѣшшаа се бѣжѣнъ ныѣ
7. сѣмъ црѣмъ прѣвыѣше не прѣлѡна. нѣ оукрѣпн сѣ а҃бїе ѿ на сѣлѣ
8. по. ѿсѣу ѿнын ѿнако прїкльоуѣншиѣ се меѣжѣ. ѿ понѣ сѣцеваа
9. сѣѣнъ ныѣмъ црѣвамъ, мнѡгы оубо ѿ дрѣгыѣ ѿ соупрѡтѣвныѣ
10. расхѣтнѣн се оусѡншѣ. мнѡгыѣ пакы безѣбѣныѣмъ вѣнамъ
11. тѣуїю елѣко а҃ще оубо прїнде ѣноѡаѣн се нѣкыѣ кѣ ѿвлѣнїю
12. на дѣлы падѣнїа, дрѣгаа ѿ дрѣгыѣ ѣ ѿ на архїеѣѣ бѣше. ѿсѣу
13. мнѡ оубо по дрѣгыѣ ѿныѣ вѣмѣнѣ погрѣшнѣшиѣ прѣсѡлѣ
14. сѣпнѣше архїеппїе. Мнѡга же рѣкше ѿ дѣавше, како оубо бо
15. <...>ѣмъ на сѣлѣзыѣтн, ѡба҃нн кѣ ѣѣмѡ ѡслабн коѣць, тѣцѣмѡ
16. <...>ѣше. сѣ ѡнѣ мала нѣкаа прѣдѡвыѣнасѡаѣше тѣуїю кѣ зрѣ
17. <...>о. по҃внѣаюѣт прѣно на сѣбѣ сѣе ѣзѣанїе, ѣко ѿ црѣн ѣспрн
18. <ѣ>мѣахѡ пнсѣнїа повелѣнїа ѡпраѣаннѣ ѿмѣ ѿсѣцаахѡ лѣпноѣ
19. повелѣнїе. ѿ наѣѣсѡваѣн тѣ подѣаюѣн по расѡѣанїю коѣмоѣ.
20. <Т>ѣко оубо по҃ваеѣ сѣцеваа ѿмъ гла҃тн ѿ не всѣко сѣн заклѡун
21. <т>н. рѣвно оубо ѿ рѣтѣ кѣо дрѣгын ѣко тѣуїю нѣашнїемѡ архїе
22. рѣѡ прнлѡун сѣ сѣн прѣсѡтѣтн сѣцевыѣ сѣарѣн ѿ нѣго бѣлоуѣн
23. <в>ѣго црѣвїа клѡуѣсѡва. ѿ коупно ѿ црѣмъ ѡнѣ велѣкыѣ тѣ
24. цѣнїемъ ѣко рѣхѣ рѣкше ѡ сѣн прѣлагаахѡ, ѿ нѣго црѣвїа
25. досѣже ѣ по ѡбразѡ поутн. коупно же а҃ще ѿ ѿсѣу вѣ нѣже ѣ
26. погрѣвѣнѣно ѣко да ѿ заѣцѣанїе мн ѡ нѣѣн велнѣнѣше ѣѣ
27. спнѣаѣмъ, тѣже послѣдѡѣатѣлно по҃мѡ, ѿ прѣвѣно бѣтн вѣ
28. спрнѣмѣаѣн коѣць ѿ сѣлѣпрошѣннѣ прнѣѣѣаѣше бо сѣ не ѣ мало ѿ мо
29. еѣо црѣвїа. а҃ще сѣн ѿзрѣсѡваѣтн доѡнаа кѣ сѣврѣшѣнѣнѣн
30. шѣ ѣ на бѣгомѣслїе. ѿ моѣ самое црѣвїе сѣце ѡ сѣлѣзаѣѣѣн.

[illegible]

15. нѣю ѿмже ѿ хода⁷ѿнѣ³ѡеть ѡбѣ⁶ нас⁷оѡца⁶ хрѣс⁶овѡла сѡ⁶ >ен
16. ѿ ѿ⁶ ѿже оубо ѡ⁷ пѡ⁷ѡыхъ сѡ⁷ ѡсѡ⁷ѣн сѡ⁷дрѡ⁷жнмѡ⁷, ѡ⁷хнѣ⁷рѣн с<...>

17. Нїже оубо н самїи прѣнзложенїи вѣспрїемлю свѣтци нн<...>

18. но ѡблѣ^м мнѡжае. ꙗко не оубо ѡ нѣго нѣшнѣго съврѣш<...>

19. παυέλ'σζο. ήλ ή άκο β'γοπεκ'ωσέ. Ο σέν, έ' ρσα να σεβ' ή να πρ'β' ή

20. $\text{БЪЗЪМЪ. КАКО ОУБО БЪГОБЛЪ Н СЪ БЪ НАУЕЛНЫН ѠУНЪ БЪЗВ<ОД>НЪ}$

21. ꙗ Ѡбщаа грѣ съѣѣаеть оужа доѡнїа. Сѣ ѡбѡ насѣоещее по

22. велѣваѣтъ бл҃гоутнѣда нѣша дръжава· ѥ повелѣваѣтъ ѥ запо

23. велѣраѣ. да Ѡблѣ^ѣ нмать блжѣн^ѣнѣиш^ѣи сѣ арх^ѣнеп^ѣи въ ж^ѣѠ^ѣнѣ.

24. спѣншію архієпіією досезаѣти все архієрѣнскыѣ цркви елн

25. кѣ ѿзложѣше свѣткѣ ѿсѣавшѣ ѡ багрѣнорѣнааго ѿ прѣо

26. помнѣмаго цѣа васнѣла блѣгароубѣнцѣ ѡсѣдѣшаа· да ни ѡ

27. ко́его ѿ ва́ архіе́рєи ѿ тѣ рѣ́нныи́ О́бразъ ко́н лихо́и мсѣ́те.

28. и ѿже древними ѿнѣми лѣты на сѣн събравшомѣ врѣменю. по

29. слѣдѣн ѣзрѣнѣ ꙗко ѡ своеѣ нагелѣзѣовати нагелѣсѣа сѣн ѡ себѣ бѣзлѣо

30. бн ꙗ́а. пакы ѿ сее поставленъ ныи и архіерѣнсѣѡен сѣн придоуаеи се,

[illegible]

1. же сѣ самодѣѣ, на ѿмн же ѿнн сѣдѣаше посѣнгше. Нѣ понѣ < бо >
2. ѿколюбѣ въ на възведе на ѿрѣскыи сѣ и цркыи прѣстолю. ѿ <...>
3. и самн елѣкоу по нѣшен сѣлѣ приоуѣрѣжѣемъ вѣшнѣю блѣ < ю >
4. сѣнѣшен сѣн архнѣпѣн по ѿнѣ сѣлагѣ словесѣ. и сѣрѣ
5. лѣнѣ даемъ ѿбразѣ сѣшѣ, насѣошн хрсѣвоуѣ слѣ нѣла
6. гѣ. и коупно оубо вѣу же и прѣвѣноѣ ѣ по ѿвѣрѣ ѿсоу оу
7. сѣбѣн оубѣ. въ елѣко оубо и ѣ сѣсѣрѣа прѣсѣсѣбѣн ѿ
8. сѣн. ѿко кѣпно и ѣ слова наѣтн Ѧ сѣ назнѣменѣхѣ. сѣѣ
9. и дѣжнѣоу въздѣхѣ блѣн ѿбѣлѣоуѣнѣмъ ѿнѣ блѣнѣнѣмъ < ѣ >
10. самодѣѣемъ. ѣже ѿвѣ оубо сѣнѣшен сѣн архнѣпѣн дѣ
11. сѣнѣ на сѣсѣмн вѣи велѣкѣи и ѿсѣн и мѣтѣ наѣло. сѣ Ѧ Ѧ сѣ
12. дѣвѣ сѣѣѣрѣнѣ ѣ сѣ Ѧ полнѣ просѣвлѣшн. и ѿ сѣбѣ пода
13. вѣн оуѣрѣжѣнѣе. Полагѣе се насѣошн хрсѣвѣ слѣмъ
14. цркѣи моѣ сѣнѣшен сѣн архнѣпѣн сѣсѣ вѣлѣгѣ. и прѣвѣн
15. ѿѣсѣнѣнѣнѣ, въ дѣвѣсѣо рѣнѣнаго оуѣрѣжѣнѣа. и и ѿпѣсѣ < тѣ >
16. по мѣѣ сѣго ѿѣлѣа насѣошнѣго прѣвѣаго и нѣнѣлѣна <...>
17. ѿмѣ Ѧсѣсѣтнѣмоу прѣвѣоѣ лѣтѣ. въ нѣѣ и нѣе блѣѣ <...>
18. на рѣнѣнаа назнѣмена дѣрѣжѣа.

Sinait. 508 (976) — Ohrid Chrysobull

(2V) (π. 113^a) Ἡ περὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν βασιλέων μετὰ τέλος εὐλάβεια μέγα μὲν τὸ θεοφιλὲς ὑπεμφαίνει, πολὺ δὲ [καὶ] μετὰ τοῦ εὐλόγου φέρει τὸ δίκαιον· ὁμοῦ τε γὰρ εὐγνωμοσύνης ἀποφέρεται δόξαν καὶ δεῖγμα πάντως οὐχὶ μικρὸν τοῦ πρὸς θεὸν σεβάσματος γίνεται, εἴ γε δὴ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰ τῆς τιμῆς διαβαίνει, τὸν αὐτοὺς βασιλεύσαντα· ὅτι δὲ (δεῖ codd.; τῶν вставлено) τῶν ἄλλων τιμὴ καὶ βασιλεῖ χρεὼν πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τοῖς γε δὴ τῷ χρόνῳ πλείστον προειληφόσι τὸ πρεσβεῖον ἀπονέμειν κατὰλληλον, ὡς ἂν εἰ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων περιετύγγανεν (παρετύγγανεν) ὄν, οὐδὲ μᾶς προσδεῖται τῆς ἀποδείξεως· ἀλλ' ἵνα γοῦν ἐντεῦθεν τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦ λόγου παραγυμνώσωμεν, φθάνει ποτὲ καὶ ὁ ἐν βασιλεὺσιν αἰοίδιμος Ἰουστινιανὸς ἐκεῖνος, ὁ μὴ μόνον τὸν ἅπαντα τῆς ἀρχῆς χρόνον μέγα τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις διασώσας ἐπίδοξον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ μνήμῃ καταλειοπῶς περιφανῶς διαρκούσαν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν γε ἤκουσαν εὐκλειαν, σπουδὴν τινα προμηθείας οὐχ ὅπως καὶ λεχθῆναι ῥαδίας (ῥαδίως) περὶ τὴν ἀγιωτάτην ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν Βουλγαρίας ἐπιδειξάμενος, ἣν δὴ καὶ Πρώτην Ἰουστινιανὴν (π. 113^b) ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας κλήσεως [κατ]ωνόμασεν. ἅτε δὴ οὖν πατρίδα ταύτην λαχὼν — ταύτην γὰρ λόγος ἔχει τῆς σωματικῆς αὐτῷ κατάρξει γενέσεως — πάντα διετέλει ποιῶν καὶ διὰ σπουδῆς μεγίστης ἐτίθετο, πῶς ἂν ἀξίως ἑαυτοῦ τὰ τροφεῖα ταύτη μεγαλοτελῶς ἀποτίσῃ καὶ πλείστον προαγάγῃ καὶ τιμῆς καὶ λαμπρότητος. ὅθεν καὶ μακρὸν ἂν εἴη καταριθμεῖν, ὅποσον αὐτῇ παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας τὸ πρεσβεῖον ἀπέδοτο, καὶ ὅσας αὐτὴν ἐσέμνυνε προτερήμασι καὶ ὅσας αὐτῶν ἐπ' ἀρχιερατεία τετιμημένων ἐκκλησιῶν περὶ ταύτην ἀφώρισε, πλην ὅτι πολλάττα καὶ μεγάλα ταύτην ἀποσεμνύνας καὶ ἅπερ ἂν βασιλέως ἔχοι δοῦναι γνώμη φιλότιμος, ἐφ' οἷς ὁμονοοῦντα καὶ τὸν ἀγιώτατον ἐκείνον ἔσχε τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης πάπαν Βιγίλιον, ἐπὶ μᾶλλον αὐτῇ τῆς εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐ[πε]φρόντισε δόξης, καὶ ὅπως ἂν παραμένειν τὰ τῆς ὑπεροχῆς παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ διαδιδόμενα, ἔνθεν τοι καὶ χρυσοβούλλοις ταῦτα λόγοις καὶ βασιλικοῖς (καὶ βασιλικοῖς προπηγ.) ἐκράτυνε διατάγμασιν. ἔμενε γοῦν ἐπιπολὺ τῆς οἰκείας δόξης ἐμφορουμένη (end of 2V; break in Slavic text) ... (3R) διεκτεθῆναι κατὰ ῥῆμα τὰ προεκτεθειμένα σιγίλλια τοῦ διαληφθέντος πορφυρογεννοῦς αὐτοκράτορος, ἵν' ἐντεῦθεν εἰεν ἐγνωσμένοι κατ' ὄνομα. εἶχε μὲν οὖν οὕτω ταῦτα μέχρι πολλοῦ· καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐφεξῆς εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων τῷ γε τούτου σκυπῷ λαβόντες γνώμην ἀκόλουθον, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ οὗτοι περὶ τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν ἐνεδείξαντο. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ φιλεῖ πολλάκις μὴ πρὸς τέλος παραμένειν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅπου δὴ καὶ (π. 121^b) συνεχῶς μετακινεῖσθαι τὰ πράγματα, οὐδ' ἐπ' αὐτῇ τὰ τελεσθέντα τῷ μακαρίτῃ τούτῳ βασιλεῖ διέμεινεν ἀπερίτρεπτα. ἀλλ' ἵσχυσε καὶ αὖθις κατὰ τούτων ὁ χρόνος καὶ ἡ ἐντεῦθεν ἄλλοτ' ἄλλως ἐπισυμβαίνουσα σύγχυσις. καὶ δὴ τῶν τοιούτων ἱερῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πολλαὶ μὲν καὶ ἐφεξῆς ὑπὸ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἀρπαγεῖσαι κατέστησαν, πολλὰ δὲ πάλιν ἐπαλλήλοισι ταῖς αἰτίαις εἰ μὴ ὅσον ἂν γε ἤκη αἰτιᾶσθαι τινα πρὸς τούμφανες τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων περίπτωσιν, ἄλλαι παρ' ἄλλους τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχιερέων

γεγόνασιν. ἐντεῦθεν πολλοὶ μὲν κατ' ἄλλους ἄλλος καιροὺς τῶν διέπειν λαχόντων τὸν θρόνον τῆς ἀγιωτάτης ταύτης ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς, πολλὰ τε εἰπόντες καὶ πράξαντες πῶς ἂν γένοιτο τούτοις ταύτας ἐπανελθεῖν, ὅμως πρὸς μὴδὲν ἀνῦσαι τέλος τὸ σπουδαζόμενον ἔδοξαν. τοῦτο δὲ πῶς ἐκείνων μικρὸν κέρδους παρείχε μόνον πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν ἀνακινουσίην αἰετὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπανάκλησιν, ὅτι παρὰ βασιλέων ἐλάμβανον (π. 122^a) ἐγγράφους προσταγὰς δικαιοσύνης, οἰοῦναι διατεμνόντων τὴν τῶν χρόνων ἐπίτασιν καὶ ἀρχὴν ἐκείνοις παρεχόντων κατὰ διαστάσεις ἐκάστοτε, πῶς ἂν ἐξέσται τοῖς τοιούτοις λαλεῖν καὶ μὴ τὴν δίκην παντελῶς αὐτοῖς ἀποκλείεσθαι. ἴσως δ' ἂν καὶ φαίη τις ἕτερος, ὡς μόνῃ δὴ τῷ νῦν ἀρχιερατικῶς λαχόντι ταύτης προῖστασθαι τοῦτ' αὐτὸ πρεσβεῖον παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβοῦς βασιλείας ἐταμιεύετο, ἵν' ἅμα μὲν καὶ βασιλεύσιν ἐκείνοις, οἱ μεγάλην τὴν σπουδὴν ὡς γε ἔφθηνεν εἰπόντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς κατεβάλλοντο, παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας βασιλείας ἀποσπασθῇ τὰ τῆς προσηκούσης αἰδοῦς, ἅμα δὲ κἀντεῦθεν εἴη καταφανές, ὅπόσον δὴ καὶ διαθέσεως ἡμεῖς περὶ αὐτὸν μεγίστης ἐκτρέφομεν. ὅθεν ἀκολούθως αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ εἶναι λαμβάνειν πέρας παραντὰ τῶν αἰτήσεων· μετέσχε γὰρ οὐκ εἰς μικρὸν ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς βασιλείας, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν(?) διερεθίζειν ἱκανὰ πρὸς τελεωτάτην περὶ ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαν καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν δὲ αὐτῆς βασιλείαν οὕτως περὶ αὐτὴν διατίθεσθαι· (3V) πρὶν γὰρ ἢ (π. 122^b) περιτεθῆναι τούτῳ τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς ἀρχιερατείας ἀξίωμα, τῆς περὶ ἡμᾶς τε οἰκείωσης μακρὸν ἀπέλαυνε χρόνον καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀγιωτάτης αὐτῷ συνυπῆρχε προήκοντα μετὰ τῶν ἀποδοδομένων αὐτῷ παρὰ τοῦ ἡμετέρου κράτους τιμῶν. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄνωθεν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης ἐπεψήφιστο θρόνος, οὐ μέγα εἰπείν, ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τούτῳ θεοῦ γεγόμεναι συνεργοὶ κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν καὶ θεῖον ἀπόστολον. προήγηται μὲν οὖν ταῦτα. ἃ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ συνεισφέρει, τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς αὐτῷ περιὸν ὀλίγους εἶναι τούτῳ παραπλησίους ποιεῖ. τὰ δ' ἐς τὴν τῶν λόγων παιδείαν μετὰ τῶν οἷς πολὺς (cod. perepravliet iz πολλοῖς v πολλὺς.) ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ λόγος συνάπτεται, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τὰλλα καταριθμοῖμεν, ὅποσα τὸν διὰ πάντων ἀγαθὸν ἀποφαίνουσιν. ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ μακαριώτατος οὗτος τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς καὶ Βουλγαρίας πάσης ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ἤδη πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν βασιλείαν καὶ τὸν περὶ τούτων λόγον κεκοινώνηκε καὶ σὺν τῷ εὐλόγῳ δικαίαν ἅμα προὔτεινεν αἴτησιν πρὸς τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν δὴ ταύτην ἀγιωτάτην ἀρ(π. 123^a)χιεπισκοπὴν ἐπανασωθῆναι τὰς ἐφ' αἷς τῶν εἰρημένων ἀρχιερατικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀπὸ πολλοῦ τοῦ χρόνου παρὰ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχιερέων, ἡδίκηται ὡς ἄνω διῶν ὁ λόγος ἐδήλωσεν, ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ βασιλεία μου ἐπικλινὲς παρέσχε τούτῳ πρὸς τὴν δέησιν οὗς καὶ ἐπιβραβεύει παραντὰ τὸν παρόντα χρυσόβουλλον αὐτῆς. καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων μέρους κατεχομένων ἀρχιερατικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ὡς δὴ καὶ ταύτας τὰ προεκτεθειμένα διαλαμβάνει σιγίλλια, οὐδὲν ἀποφαινόμεθα πλέον, ὅτι μὴδ' ὑπὸ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀρτίως διατελοῦσιν ἀρχὴν, ἡ ὅτι θεῷ μελήσει περὶ αὐτῶν, ᾧ καὶ πάντα τὰ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἀναρτῶμεν, πῶς ἂν εἰ εὐδοκήσῃ, καὶ ταύτας εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἐκείνην τάξιν ἐπαναγάγῃ καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐπισυνάψῃ σχολιόματι. τὸ δ' οὖν παρὸν θεσπίζει τὸ εὐσεβὲς ἡμῶν κράτος καὶ προστάσσει

καὶ διατάττεται, ἵν' ἄδειαν ἔχει τοαποτοῦδε ὁ μακαριώτατος οὗτος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος πρὸς τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν ἀγιωτάτην ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν ἐπανασώσασθαι πάσας (π. 123^b) τὰς ἀρχιερατικὰς ἐκκλησίας, ὅσαι τοῖς προεκτεθείσι σιγγλλίοις τοῦ διαληφθέντος πορφυρογεννοῦς καὶ αὐιδίμου βασιλέως Βασιλείου τοῦ Βουλγαροκτόνου διελημμέναι παρ' οἰουδήτηνος τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχιερέων οἰωδήτην τῶν εἰρημένων τρόπων πεπλεονέκτῃται· καὶ ἥτις μὲν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἐκείνοις χρόνοις ὑπ' αὐτὴν συνετάττετο, καιρῷ δὲ ὕστερον ἀποσεισασμένη τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἄρχεσθαι ἄρχειν αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἡγάπησε μᾶλλον, πάλιν ὑπ' αὐτὴν κατασταίῃ καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερατεῦεν τῆς τοιαύτης λαχῶν (4R) πνευματικῶς ὑποταγείῃ τῷ μακαρίῳ τούτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ ἅπαν τὸ κατ' ὀφειλὴν ἀποδώσει, ὡς ὑπὸ τούτῳ ταπτόμενος· εἴ τις δὲ καὶ εἰς ἰδίαν ἄνωθεν καθισταμένη ἀρχὴν ἢ ἄλλως πῶς διατελοῦσα καὶ μὴ ὑποκειμένη τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ μίαν τινα ἢ καὶ δύο καὶ πλείους, καὶ εἰς ὅσον ἂν ἀπλῶς ἤκοιεν μέτρου τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὴν ἀρχιερατικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῷ καιρῷ ξυνεπιτεθείσα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν μεθειλκύσατο καὶ ταύτην ἢ καὶ ταύτας παρευθὺς ἀπολύσῃ ὑπὸ τὴν ἀγιοτά(π. 124^a)τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν καὶ αὐθὺς καθίστασθαι, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τις τούτων τε κἀκείνων ἔχει προβαλέσθαι δικαίωσιν ἐξ ἐπιγράφου διαταγῆς τινὸς τῶν αὐιδίμων βασιλέων, ὅσοι μετὰ τὸν μακαριστὸν ἐν βασιλεῦσι τὸν πορφυρογεννῆ Βουλγαροκτόνον Βασίλειον τὴν ἡγεμόνα τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν καὶ κατεδέξαντο καὶ διῦθνον, σὺν τελευταίῳ δὴ τῷ ἀεμνήστῳ πορφυρογεννῆ βασιλεῖ τῷ Κομνηνῷ Μανουῆλ· ὁ γάρ τοι τοιοῦτος ἀρχιερεὺς προσκομίζων εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν βασιλείαν καὶ διεμφανίζων τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐκείνην δικαίωσιν διαμενεῖ κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν τάξιν παρὰ μηδενὸς διοχλούμενος· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄνω εἴ τι καὶ συμβέβηκε πῶς ἐπὶ ταύταις οἴασου περιπετείας, ὁ πορφυρογεννῆς ἐκείνος αὐτοκράτωρ Βασίλειος διὰ τῶν προεκτεθέντων τούτου σιγγλλίων διαλελυκῶς ἀπεκλείσατο. τὰ δὲ μετὰ τὸν πορφυρογεννῆ καὶ μακαρίτην Κομνηνὸν Μανουῆλ ἐκείνον αὐτάνακτα εἴ τις ἴσως γε καὶ ἔχει προτείνειν οἰονοῦν ἐκ βασιλέως δικαίωμα, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ μετ' ἐκείνον (π. 124^b) ταῖς ἐπισυμβαίνουσας ἐπηκολουθηκέναι μᾶλλον συγχύσει λογίζομεθα, ὅτι καὶ μικρὸν ὁ χρόνος προέβη καὶ παραυτὰ τῆς βασιλίδος ταύτης ἐξώσθημεν, μὴ τὸ στέργον ἔχειν τοῦτο διαταπτόμεθα. τοῦτο δὲ φαμεν οὐχ ὅτι δὴ καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις αὐιδίμοις βασιλεῦσι τὴν ὀφειλομένην αἰδῶ διασφῆξιν ἡμεῖς οὐ βουλόμεθα, ἀλλ' ὅτι γε δικαίως ὑπειλήφαμεν μᾶλλον ὡς ἂν εἴ τις γε ἐκείνων ἴσως τι τοιοῦτον ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς δικαίων ἔφθασε διατάξασθαι ἐκτὸς ἱσταμένης ἂν ἀνάγκης τῶν ἐπισυμβαίνουσῶν περιπτώσεων τῆς καιρικῆς ἀνωμαλίας, κατὰ νοῦν τε τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔσχε καὶ διεπράξατο· ἐτέρως γὰρ πῶς ἂν οἰήσετό τις ἀληθῆς ἐπινώμων τοῦ ἐκείνων σκοποῦ, ὡς οὐκ ἂν κἀκείνους ἀγαθοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἢ αὐτὴ συνετηρεῖτο εὐλάβεια πρὸς τοὺς δηλωθέντας (4V) πρὸς αὐτὸν αὐτοκράτορας, ἐφ' οἷς ἐκείνοι διεφθάσαντο πράξαντες. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ γέ φιλανθρώπως (φιλάνως cod.) θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπανήγαγεν εἰς τὸ πατρῷον τοῦτο καὶ βασιλείον ἔδαφος, τί μὴ καὶ αὐτοί, ὅσον εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν δύναμιν ἤκει διὰ τῆς ἄνωθεν χάριτος, (π. 125^a) τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ κατὰ τὸν τοῦ εἰκότος σύμβαλλοίμεθα λόγον, καὶ τὰ πρεσβεῖα

προσαποδοίημεν τρόπον, ὃν διὰ τοῦ παρόντος χρυσοβούλλου διεξεθέμεθα, καὶ ἅμα μὲν θεῷ τε καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ τὸ προσήκον ἔνθεν ἀφοσιώσαιμεν, εἰς δὲ καὶ τὰ τῆς τοιᾶσδε διαβαίνει τιμῆς, καθὼς ἅμα δὴ καὶ τῷ τοῦ λόγου κατάρξαι παραντικά διεσημηνάμεθα, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἀποτίσαιμεν χάριν τοῖς φιλευσεβέσιν ἐκείνοις μακαριστοῖς αὐτοκράτορσιν, ὧν ὁ μὲν τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ δεξιὰ τις ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐγεγόνει τῶν μεγάλων καὶ τιμῶν καὶ πρεσβείων ἀρχή, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐφεξῆς καλῶς ποιοῦντες τῶν ἐκείνῳ περὶ ταύτην δοξάντων ἐξ ἑαντῶν παρέσχον ἀσφάλειαν. προσέσται τοίνυν ὁ παρῶν χρυσόβουλλος τῆς βασιλείας ἡμῶν τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ πάσης Βουλγαρίας τῇ καὶ Πρώτῃ Ἰουστινιανῇ εἰς διαρκούσαν τῶν εἰρημένων βεβαίωσιν, ὁ καὶ ἀπολυθεὶς κατὰ μῆνα τοῦτον τῆς ἐνισταμένης Ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ἑξακισχιλιοστοῦ ἑπτακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ ἔτους, (π. 125^b) ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον εὐσεβὲς καὶ θεοπρόβλητον ὑπεσημῆνατο κράτος: — (End of Slavic text)

Notes

¹I am grateful to Panagiotis A. Agapitos and Paul Hollingsworth for comments and suggestions, and particularly for assistance with the Greek text, to András Riedlmayer for help with the Hungarian commentary in Wenzel 1870, to V.A. Dybo for bringing Muz. 3070 to my attention, and to Robert Mathiesen for advice on numerous problems of this manuscript. They are not, of course, responsible for any error of fact or interpretation. This research was assisted by grants from the Joint Committee on Soviet Studies of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies with funds provided by the U.S. Department of State, from the National Graduate Fellowship Program, from the Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship Program, and from the International Research and Exchanges Board.

²Голубинский, Е. *Краткий очерк истории православных церквей болгарской, сербской и румынской или молдо-валаиской*. Москва. 1871. 126–27, 258–63; Дринов, Марин С. 1873/1911. “Три грамоти дадени от императора Василий II на Български Охридски архиепископ Иоан около 1020 лято.” *Съчинения* 2. 205–08; Дринов, Марин С. 1873/1911. “Въпрос за българската и сръбската църкви пред съдилището на Лионский събор в 1274 год.” *Съчинения* 2. 224; Иречек, Константин. [= Konstantin Josef Jireček.] 1876/1978. *История на българите*. София: Наука и изкуство. (NB: The first edition appeared simultaneously in Czech and German in 1876. I cite from the 1978 Bulgarian edition, edited by P. Petrov, which is a combination of the 1929 Bulgarian, edited by V.N. Zlatarski, and Jireček's notes for a projected revised edition, which were edited by St. Mladenov and first published separately in 1939.) 320–32; Hertzberg, Gustav Friedrich. 1883. *Geschichte der Byzantiner und des Osmanisches Reiches bis gegen Ende des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*. Berlin. 430; Gelzer, Heinrich. 1893. “Ungedruckte und wenig bekannte Bistümerverzeichnisse der orientalischen Kirche.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* II. 41–42; Gelzer, Heinrich. 1897. “Abriß der byzantinischen Kaisergeschichte.” In Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*. 2. Aufl. München. 1053; Gelzer, Heinrich. 1902. *Das Patriarchat von Achrida. Geschichte und Urkunden*. [Abhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften XX:5.] Leipzig. 13; Marc, Paul. 1903. *Plan eines Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der Neueren Zeit*. München. 98; Norden, Walter. 1903. *Das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Trennung der beiden Mächte und das Problem ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergang des byzantinischen Reichs (1453)*. Berlin. 483–84; Новаковић, Стојан. 1908. “Охридска архиепископија у почетку XI века.” *Глас српске краљевске академије* LXXVI. У Београду. 1–3; Иречек, Константин. [= Konstantin Josef Jireček.] 1911/1922. *Историја срба*. Београд. 237; de Thallóczy, Ludovicus, Constantinus Jireček et Emilianus de Sufmay. 1913. *Acta et diplomatica. Res Albaniae mediae aetatis*. I. Vidobonae. #281; Снегаров, Иван. 1924. *История на Охридската архиепископија. Први том*. София. 157–58; Chapman, Conrad. 1926. *Michel Paléologue. Restaurateur de l'empire byzantin (1261–1282)*. Paris. 91–92; Dölger, Franz. 1932. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches. Teil III. (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, Reihe A, Abt. 1.)* München–Berlin. #1992; Селищев, Афанасий Матвеевич. 1934. “Завет первой юстиниани.” *Македонски преглед* IX/2. 12–13; Станојевић, Ст. 1935. “Краљ Урош.” *Годишњица Николе Чушића* XLIV. 164; Ostrogorsky, George. 1969. *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick: Rutgers. (English translation of the third German edition of 1963.) 457; Динић, М. 1961. “Comes Constantinus.” *Зборник радова византолошког института* 7. 2; and Dölger, Franz. 1977. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches. Teil III. (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, Reihe A, Abt. 1.)* Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Peter Wirth. München. #1989a.

³Dölger 1932:#1992, Dölger 1977:#1989a.

⁴Dölger, Franz. 1924. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches. Teil I. (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, Reihe A, Abt. 1.)* München–Berlin. #806–08.

⁵First published in Rhalles, G.A. and M. Potles. 1855. *Σύνταγμα τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, V. Athens. 266-69.

⁶Michael's introduction is reprinted in Wenzel, Gusztáv. 1870. *Codex diplom. arpadianus continuatus*. VIII. [Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Diplomataria XIII.] Pest. 431-34. The excerpt from Basil's edict is reprinted in Zachariae von Lingenthal, Carl Edward. 1857. *Jus Graeco-Romanum. Pars III. Novellae constitutiones*. Lipsiae. 319-20.

⁷It is part of a large XVI-XVII century manuscript; see Бенешевич, В.Н. 1911. *Описание греческих рукописей монастыря Святой Екатерины на Синае*. Том I. С.-Пб. 323-47 for a description of the contents.

⁸Голубинский, *op. cit.*, 259-63.

⁹Бенешевич, *op. cit.*, 542-54.

¹⁰Gelzer, "Ungedruckte...", 42-46.

¹¹Dölger, Franz und Johannes Karayannopulos. 1968 *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre. Erster Abschnitt: Die Kaiserurkunden*. [Byzantinisches Handbuch im Rahmen des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft XII.3.1.1.] München. 123.

¹²*Op. cit.*, 126-27.

¹³*Op. cit.*, 3.

¹⁴Голубинский, *op. cit.*, 127, 263; Дринов, "Три грамоты...", 207; Дринов, "Въпрос...", 224; Norden, *op. cit.*, 483; de Thallóczy et al., *op. cit.*, #281; Снегаров, *op. cit.*, 157; Chapman, *op. cit.*, 91; Dölger 1932:#1992; Динић, *op. cit.*, 2; and Dölger 1977:#1989a give the date of issue as August 1272. Hertzberg, *op. cit.*, 430; Gelzer, "Ungedruckte...", 42; Gelzer, "Abriß...", 1053; Gelzer, *Das Patriarchat...*, 13; Marc, *op. cit.*, 98; Станојевић, *op. cit.*, 164; and Ostrogorsky, *op. cit.*, 457 give the year as 1272, with no indication of the month.

¹⁵For descriptions of Muz. 3070 and Zogr. 151 and a discussion of Grigorović's acquisition of the former, see Birnbaum, David J. 1987. "The Life of Stefan Lazarević: a Contribution to the Study of the Manuscript Tradition." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* XXXIV (1986), 7-31.

¹⁶Serbian despot, 1389-1427. His *Life* was composed in 1431 by Konstantin Kostenečki. See Birnbaum, *op. cit.*, for discussion and bibliography.

¹⁷*История...*, 321.

¹⁸Similarly, Jireček, (*Историја...*, 237) explains that "Да нашкоди српској и бугарској автокефалној цркви, порицао им је Михаило правну подлогу, обновивши Охридску старе привилегије Василија II (у авг. 1272), а тако исто и оне, које су ову цркву везивале за старо место Justiniana Prima (1273)."

¹⁹*Op. cit.*, #281.

²⁰Григорович, Виктор Иванович. 1848. *Очерк ученого путешествия по европейской Турции*. [Ученые записки, издаваемые императорским казанским университетом 3.]

²¹There is, however, the following brief comment (pp. 113-14): "С падением первой династии болгарских царей, с властью латинов и деспотов эфирских, наконец с преобладанием сербским, город и епархия [i.e. Ohrid - DJB] мало помалу теряли свое значение. В целой

истории южных Словян этот пункт быть может, самый темный, и тем не менее в исследовании хода просвещения Словян будет всегда предметом, от раскрытия которого ожидать можно важных пояснений." Grigorovič visited Ohrid in May 1845, and his comments may have been inspired by his already having discovered, during his visit to Zograph some five months earlier, the documents whose absence he laments.

²²Šafařík, Pavel Josef. 1851/1873. *Památky děvného písemnictví jihoslovánův*. [Subsection entitled *Okázky občanského písemnictví*. 1870.] (Vydání druhé, doplňky z pozůstalosti Šafaříkovy rozmnožené, upravil Josef Jireček.) V Praze. 27.

²³*Op. cit.*, 431, 434. The remarks on p. 431 concerning a signature on the chrysobull are puzzling. These late copies could not, of course, bear the emperor's signature, and Muz. 3070 does not mention Michael's name at all.

²⁴*Op. cit.* Dölger's 1977:#1989a reference to Seliščev's 1934 article errs in labeling this South Slavic manuscript as Russian.

²⁵As is his treatment of the text of *Life of Stefan Lazarevič*. See Birnbaum, *op. cit.*, for details.

²⁶*Op. cit.*, 10.

²⁷*Op. cit.*, 12.

²⁸Whether the note on the bottom margin of 2V, Ⲅⲃⲫⲉⲣⲁⲙⲁ ⲥⲉ<...> Ⲅⲭⲉⲛⲁⲣⲁ, refers to the missing folia is unclear. This note seems to be in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript, but perhaps in a different ink.

²⁹*Op. cit.*, 12.

³⁰*Исследования...*, 321.

³¹*Op. cit.*, 11.

³²*Op. cit.*, 10-11.

³³*Op. cit.* 542-54.

³⁴For a discussion of editorial principles in reproducing accented Slavic manuscripts, see Birnbaum, David J. 1987. "On the Methods of Analyzing Accented Slavic Manuscripts." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* XXXIV (1986), 123-42.